REMARKS

Claims 1-46 are pending in this application. Claims 1-8, 10-33 and 36-46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Hanson. Claims 9, 34 and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) based on Hanson combined with Leon. None of the claims is currently amended. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The presently claimed invention distinguishes Hanson, both alone and in combination with Leon, because the state information saved by the back-end device is provided to an access point to re-establish communication. The Office suggests that col. 9, lines 15-23 of Hanson teaches communicating the saved state information from the back-end device to an access point. However, the cited passage merely states that the information is used to maintain and resume sessions, without providing further detail. The passage at col. 9, lines 55-65, also cited by the Office, describes how the state information is used in accordance with the Hanson teaching. In particular, the mobility management server (102) uses the information to maintain the connection to the host system (110) by acknowledging receipt of data and queuing requests. In other words, the server functions as a proxy for the mobile end system. In contrast, the presently claimed back-end device provides state information to an access point to facilitate re-establishment of communications with the mobile device. Since the host system (110) of Hanson is not equivalent to an access point, Hanson fails to teach the claimed invention.

Hanson teaches a technique that may help maintain communication, but fails to solve the problem to which the presently claimed invention is directed. As described in the specification at page 4, lines 23-28, when there is a hand-off from an old access point to a new access point, the state information maintained by the old access point is lost. This is disruptive because the new access point must re-build the state information to re-establish communication with the mobile

Serial No. 09/748698   - 11 -   Art Unit: 2157

client. Since the proxy function taught by Hanson fails to provide any state information to the new access point to facilitate re-establishment of communication, the hand-off would still be disruptive from the perspective of the new access point. However, the presently claimed back-end system helps to solve the problem by communicating the state information of the old access point to the new access point. Since the new access point is not required to re-build the state information, hand-off is less disruptive.

The distinguishing features discussed above are recited in the claims. For example, claim 1 distinguishes Hanson, both alone and in combination with Leon, by reciting "re-establishing the communication session using the saved state information by communicating the saved state information from the back end device to one of the wireless access point devices." Similarly, claim 10 distinguishes Hanson, both alone and in combination with Leon, by reciting "session re-establishment logic operably coupled to subsequently reestablish the communication session using the saved state information by communicating the saved state information to one of the wireless access point devices." Claim 20 distinguishes Leon and Hanson by reciting "the state maintenance logic operable to contemporaneously save state information relating to multiple communication sessions associated with multiple wireless access point devices." Claims 30, 37 and 42 recite similarly distinguishing language. Withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1, 10, 20, 30, 37 and 42 is therefore requested.

Claims 2-9, 11-19, 21-29, 31-36, 38-41, and 43-46 are dependent claims which further distinguish the invention, and which are allowable for the same reasons stated above with regard to their respective base claims. Withdrawal of the rejections of those dependent claims is therefore also requested.

Serial No. 09/748698   - 12 -   Art Unit: 2157

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Holmes W. Anderson, Applicants' Attorney at 978-264-4001 (X305) so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

For these reasons, and in view of the above amendments, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

June 6, 2005
Date

Holmes Anderson, Reg. No. 37,272
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Steubing McGuinness & Manaras LLP
125 Nagog Park Drive
Acton, MA 01720
(978) 264-6664

Docket No. 120-201
Dd: 6/28/2005